

FILED IN THE
U.S. DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

Jan 23, 2025

SEAN F. MCAVOY, CLERK

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

JOSANNE R. ACOSTA,

Plaintiff,

vs.

US GOVERNMENT,

Defendant.

No. 2:25-CV-20-MKD

ORDER DISMISSING ACTION FOR
LACK OF JURISDICTION AND
VENUE

ECF No. 2

On January 16, 2025, the Court received Plaintiff's Complaint, seeking the issuance of a "Writ of Mandamus as required by the Bank of America," mailed via registered mail from Tabaquite, Trinidad and Tobago. ECF Nos. 1 at 7, 1-1. Plaintiff is advised that a federal district court may only address requests for relief in cases which are properly before the court, against Defendants over whom the court has jurisdiction.

While the complaint is on a form captioned for this Court, it appears Plaintiff intended for this action to be filed in Washington, District of Columbia (D.C.). *See*

1 ECF No. 1 at 4-5. The apparent misfiling of this case in this district cannot vest this
2 court with jurisdiction to consider Plaintiff's claims. In most instances federal courts
3 do not have nationwide personal jurisdiction. *See Omni Capital Int'l, Ltd. V.*
4 *Rudolph Wolff & Co., Ltd.*, 484 U.S. 97, 104-105 (1987); *see also* Fed. R. Civ. P.
5 4(k)(1)(A). This Court does not have jurisdiction over Plaintiff's claims.

6 The only named Defendant to this action is vaguely identified as "US
7 Government," with an address for the Clerk of Court of this Court. ECF No. 1 at 2-
8 3. Plaintiff states, "The Certificate of Ownership of Funds was issued in part by the
9 Executive Director World Bank Group in Washington DC." *Id.* at 4.

10 Plaintiff presents no facts from which the Court could infer that any events
11 occurred in this judicial district or that any identified Defendant resides here. As
12 such, venue is not proper in the Eastern District of Washington. *See* 28 U.S.C. §
13 1391(b).

14 This Court lacks jurisdiction and venue over any claim Plaintiff might assert.
15 The Court finds, based on the allegations of the complaint suggesting Plaintiff may
16 be the intended target of a financial scam, that it would not be in the interests of
17 justice to transfer this case to another Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1631.

18 Accordingly, **IT IS ORDERED:**

19 1. This action is **DISMISSED** for lack of jurisdiction and venue.
20

1 2. Plaintiff's application to proceed *in forma pauperis*, ECF No. 2, is

2 **DENIED as moot.**

3 3. The Court certifies pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3) that any appeal of
4 this Order could not be taken in good faith and would lack any arguable basis in law
5 or fact.

6 **IT IS SO ORDERED.** The Clerk of Court is **DIRECTED** to enter this
7 Order, **enter judgment**, provide copies to Plaintiff, and close this file. Plaintiff shall
8 file no further documents in this file.

9 DATED January 23, 2025.

10 s/Mary K. Dimke
11 MARY K. DIMKE
12 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20